UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.

EXAMINER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	10

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.	Applicant(s)
08/946,710	Brod
Examiner	Group Art Unit
Seyale	1761

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Response

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE IS SET TO EXPIRE _____ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a response be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for response specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a response within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for response is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication .
- Failure to respond within the set or extended period for response will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 3/15/99.

☒ This action is **FINAL.**

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____.

Attachment(s)

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Other _____

Office Action Summary

In view of the Appeal Brief filed on 3/15/99, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. New grounds of rejection are set forth below at paragraphs 7-11.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(a) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(b) request reinstatement of the appeal.

If reinstatement of the appeal is requested, such request must be accompanied by a supplemental appeal brief, but no new amendments, affidavits (37 CFR 1.130, 1.131 or 1.132) or other evidence are permitted. See 37 CFR 1.193(b)(2).

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> **"A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -**
> **(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States."**

2. Claims 1-4, 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by Cummins, Jr. (U.S. Patent 5019382).

See col. 4, lines 19-36, col. 5, lines 50-55, col. 6, lines 12-26, col. 13, and the claims. Such disclosure meets the claims.

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
> Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) and (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

4. Claims 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Cummins, Jr. (U.S. Patent 5019382). The disclosure is the same as above as discussed for claims 1 and 8. The patent does not disclose an alternate day dosing. However, it does show that a daily dosage is possible, as a single dosage or as divided and administered in a multiple daily dose regimen. The reference also teaches a staggered regimen of 1-3 days per week or month as an alternative to daily dosing. See col. 5, lines 50-55. With such a flexibility as taught by the reference, and since it is common knowledge in the art to employ such a regimen instead of continuous dosing, for a variety of reasons such as, toxicity, the condition of the patient, patient reaction and amelioration of the disease condition, etc., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art to adopt an alternate day dosing and administer IFN as shown by Cummins for MS.

5. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Cummins, Jr. (U.S. Patent 5019382) in view of Shibutani et al. (Iyakuhin Kenkyu, vol. 18(4), pp. 571-82, 1987) and further in view of Sobel (abstract of WO 9420122 or US Patent 5624895).

The disclosure for the patent is as discussed above. The whole range of dosages claimed by the instant invention is not shown. However, the Shibutani abstract indicates that IFN toxicity studies with rats showed that it was tolerated well. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to administer dosages higher than that shown in the patent with the reasonable expectation that such doses would not produce toxicity side-effects in humans. It would also have been obvious to employ such an alternate day dose regimen instead of continuous dosing, for a variety of reasons such as, toxicity, the condition of the patient, patient reaction and amelioration of the disease condition, etc. Note that although Cummins discloses interferon for autoimmune diseases which includes the diabetes claimed herein, the reference does not expressly state that the disease condition is diabetes. However Sobel shows the use interferon for diabetes. See col. 8, line 63 to col. 9, line 5 and claims 11-12 and 18.

6. This application contains sequence disclosures that are encompassed by the definitions for nucleotide and/or amino acid sequences set forth in 37 CFR 1.821(a)(1) and (a)(2). A computer readable form (CRF) of the sequence listing was submitted. However, the CRF could not be processed by the Scientific and Technical Information Center (STIC) for the reason(s) set forth on the attached CRF Diskette Problem Report. Direct the reply to the undersigned. Applicant is requested to return a copy of the attached CRF Diskette Problem Report with the reply.

7. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

8. Claims 1-7 are provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-7 of copending application Serial No. 08/631470. This is a *provisional* double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

9. Claims 1-18 are provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-18 of copending application Serial No. 08/844731. This is a *provisional* double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

10. Claims 8-18 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-18 of copending application Serial No. 08/631470 in view of the abstracts of WO 94/20122, Gross et al. and Giron et al. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the subject matter of these claims would have been obvious in view of the abstracts that show that it was already known in the art at the time the invention was made that interferon prevented the onset of diabetes. [Filing date accorded to the claims 8, 12 and 16 reciting diabetes mellitus (prevention, etc.)is 4/15/96].

This is a *provisional* obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

11. The obviousness-type double patenting rejection is a judicially established doctrine based upon public policy and is primarily intended to prevent prolongation of the patent term by prohibiting claims in a second patent not patentably distinct from claims in a first patent. *In re Vogel*, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970). A timely fil d terminal disclaimer in

compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.321(b) would overcome an actual or provisional rejection on this ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 C.F.R. § 1.78(d).

Since applicant was aware of the claims being the same in both cases 08/946710 and 08/844731 under 37 CFR 1.56 and was already in receipt of an action in 08/631470, accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP. § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Examiner C. Sayala at telephone number (703) 308-3035. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0166. The group fax number is (703) 305-3599.

C. Sayala
Primary Examiner
Group 1700.

David Lacey
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 1700
3/23/99